



LAKE ELMO AIRPORT FEDERAL EA / STATE EAW

Public Event #2 Meeting Minutes

Oak-Land Middle School
August 17, 2017

Agenda

- 6:00 – 6:30 P.M. – Open house with informational boards and an opportunity to visit with MAC representatives to learn about the Lake Elmo EA/EAW activities.
- 6:30 – 7:00 P.M. – Presentation on the specifics regarding the alternative scenarios being considered
- 7:00 – 7:30 P.M. – Presentation Q&A regarding the alternative options presented
- 7:30 – 8:00 P.M. – Community/MAC one-on-one engagement session to discuss concerns, ideas and opportunities with MAC representatives

MAC/Mead & Hunt Attendees

Chad Leque
Dana Nelson
Neil Ralston
Joe Harris
Patrick Hogan
Melissa Scovronski
Brad Juffer
Amie Kolesar
Gary Schmidt
Michael Madigan
Evan Barrett
Colleen Bosold
Stephanie Ward
Chris Rossmiller

Representing

Metropolitan Airports Commission
Metropolitan Airports Commission
Metropolitan Airports Commission
Metropolitan Airports Commission, Lake Elmo Airport Manager
Metropolitan Airports Commission
Metropolitan Airports Commission
Metropolitan Airports Commission
Metropolitan Airports Commission
MAC Commissioner District F
Mead & Hunt
Mead & Hunt
Mead & Hunt
Mead & Hunt

The attached report represents this writer's interpretation of items discussed during the meeting. Any corrections or additional information should be brought to our attention for clarification.

Presentation slides and informational boards presented at this meeting, as well as the agenda, newsletter and a handout provided to the public, are available on the project website at www.metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Lake-Elmo-Environmental-Assessment/Documents-and-Links.aspx.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Present the alternative scenarios being considered for proposed airfield improvements at Lake Elmo Airport.
- Provide an opportunity for community members to ask questions, discuss concerns and share ideas with MAC representatives and for MAC representatives to respond to inquiries from community members.

Items discussed were as follows:

Chad Leque, Director of Environmental Programs for the MAC, welcomed and thanked everyone for coming. After introducing himself, he introduced key project team members who comprised the Q&A panel: Dana Nelson (MAC Manager of Noise & Environmental Programs, who is heading up the stakeholder engagement efforts), Evan Barrett (Mead & Hunt project manager), Neil Ralston (MAC aviation planner) and Joe Harris (Lake Elmo Airport Manager).

Chad then noted that the MAC is trying to evolve and improve the stakeholder engagement process based on previous community feedback, and pointed out some changes made for this event. One change that Chad mentioned is a top concerns sticker board at the sign-in table – each attendee had the opportunity to place one sticker next to their top concern regarding the proposed improvements at Lake Elmo Airport, and the concern with the most stickers will be addressed following the alternatives presentation. Another MAC change is addition of a moderator for the evening to help make sure that all voices are heard and everyone has a chance to ask their questions and get a response.

Chad then introduced the moderator, Todd Streeter. Todd has served the St. Croix Valley area in a variety of roles, including as President/Executive Director of the Greater Stillwater Chamber of Commerce; Mayor of the City of Lake St. Croix Beach; cofounder and chair of the Lower St. Croix Valley Foundation; and a board member of the Stillwater-Oak Park Heights Convention & Visitors Bureau. Chad stated the MAC has been impressed with his record and hopes the community finds what he brings to the process beneficial. He then turned it over to Todd.

Todd thanked everyone for coming and taking time out of their schedules to be at the meeting. He stressed that all questions, input, concerns and comments should be heard. He introduced the agenda for the evening and pointed out information regarding the Q&A on the backside of the agenda. He also stated that the Q&A should be specific to the alternatives information covered during the presentation, so everyone has an opportunity to learn about the new information being presented. He also pointed out the handout has information about some of the other concerns that have been expressed in past meetings. Finally, he introduced the one-on-one engagement session opportunity following the Q&A session for community members to speak directly with MAC representatives about questions or concerns beyond those related to the presentation. He closed by stating that all of these efforts are being made to try to get as much information to and feedback from everyone at tonight's meeting. He then turned it over to Evan Barrett.

Evan Barrett, Mead & Hunt's project manager and lead aviation planner for the environmental assessment, began the presentation, acknowledging that many people in attendance have followed the Long-Term Comprehensive Plan that was completed last year, and noted that this is a continuation of that process. He thanked those people for their continued interest in the project. He also acknowledged that others may not be familiar with the project and that this might be a lot of new information for

Meeting Minutes

those people. He encouraged those people to talk to him or other MAC representatives after the presentation.

He then gave a presentation covering:

- The project timeline – where we've been, what's been accomplished so far, and where we're going
- An overview of the purpose and need (or the justification) of the project
- The range of alternatives that are being considered in this Environmental Assessment (EA)/Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW)
- The alternatives evaluation and screening process, and the resulting preferred alternatives that came out of that process
- Next steps – the team will be evaluating the environmental effects for the preferred alternatives. Evan also announced the next Community Engagement Panel (CEP) meeting will be October 19th and the third public event is tentatively scheduled for November.

A copy of this presentation can be found at: metroairports.org/General-Aviation/Lake-Elmo-Environmental-Assessment/21D-Public-Event-presentation.aspx

Evan thanked everyone for attending and said he looked forward to questions during the Q&A session or the one-on-one engagement session in the cafeteria. He then turned it back over to Todd.

Todd then said that before the Q&A session began, the team would like to address the top concern community members voted on from the top concerns sticker board at sign-in. He turned it over to Dana Nelson.

Dana stated that she was actually going to address the number two concern on the board, as the item that got the most votes on the board was "I don't have concerns related to these improvements." The number two concern identified was "justification for the project." Dana mentioned this idea came out of some feedback from the CEP and is a concerted effort to try and understand why people are taking time out of their personal schedules to come to these meetings and learn more about the project. She said the MAC has heard a number of concerns and they boil down to these three areas.

Dana mentioned that Evan had touched on the Purpose & Need of the improvements in the presentation, which is essentially the justification. The justification came out of a series of deficiencies identified in the Lake Elmo Airport LTCP; the first being that the pavement needs to be replaced; the second being that the runway protection zones (RPZs) have some land uses within them that the FAA considers incompatible. The FAA wants to see airports controlling the RPZs for both the safety of those using the airport and the safety of those on the ground. Those things, at a minimum, need to be addressed. The RPZ issue is the reason the MAC is considering the shift of the runway to the northeast. This would put those RPZs on MAC property; it's a plan the MAC has always intended to implement, which is why the MAC bought property to line up a primary runway in that configuration so the MAC is best using the property it already has to control those areas off the runway ends. The third element of the justification is to better accommodate the users that are using the airport today – that's the reason for extending the primary runway. She pointed out a graphic in the newsletter and on one of the boards in the cafeteria showing the runway length requirements for different types of aircraft. She noted this was some of the methodology and science that went into establishing the preferred runway length of 3,500 feet, which had initially been set at 3,600 feet in the LTCP. The MAC heard significant community concerns about that length during the LTCP process, and the preferred alternative was updated through

that process to 3,500 feet. The last element of the justification is to update the navigational technology for arriving aircraft to make sure that the MAC airport system stays up to date with today's technologies. She then turned it back over to Todd for the Q&A. Todd reminded the audience that the handout received at sign-in has information that should answer many questions regarding the top community concerns.

Todd then opened the Q&A session and informed the audience that a staff member would be walking around with a microphone for people to use when asking their questions so all can hear. He requested that those asking questions state their name and address and keep questions or comments to two minutes each so that the panel could get through everyone's questions. He stated that if time ran out during the Q&A, there would also be the one-on-one engagement session following for further questions and discussion.

The presentation Question & Answer session that followed is described below. *(Responses are indicated in italics.)*

- Ann Bucheck, resident of City of Lake Elmo. When you're talking about how you're going to go ahead into the environmental assessment you said you were going to use B1 as your thing to look at, aren't you also going to look at no change at all beyond maintaining what is there today? *Evan Barrett responded that the no action alternative is essentially a no build alternative beyond what's existing at the airport today. He said there's no alternative on the table that would involve doing nothing whatsoever as far as maintaining the airport. Ann responded, then you should be using that also as your comparison – that's what you said at the beginning. But then you got to the end and you didn't include it. I'm hoping that you will be including that. Evan responded yes, and explained that the no action alternative will provide the baseline. It will compare the environmental effects of maintaining the airport as-is (what's being referred to as the "no action alternative") to those of Alternative B1 and the other preferred alternatives on the list. He also stated that the no action alternative was included on the Preferred Alternatives slide near the end of the presentation listing the alternatives that would be carried forward for full environmental review.*
- Molly Olson, resident of West Lakeland Township. I'm wondering if you can clarify that answer a little bit more. It's very confusing for me. At the last meeting I went to, all the community members there were in agreement that your language of "no change or no action" was very confusing for the average person, and I was hoping that I would see a different terminology in this presentation. You're not speaking to the FAA that uses that terminology. It seemed like you'd said that was not going to happen (just repairing the runway as is), but now in your answer to her it sounds like you're saying it is an option? It's very confusing. *Evan Barrett responded that the no action alternative is the same as a no build or a no expansion alternative, if you want to think of it that way. He said "no action" is a term the FAA requires we use in these documents. He explained the intent of the no action alternative is to provide a baseline for comparison with the preferred alternative, as the preferred alternative must be compared to something in order to identify what the environmental effects are. The no action alternative provides that basis for comparison. Evan noted that the no action alternative does not meet the purpose and need, but will be evaluated across that full range of environmental categories that the federal and state regulations require we look at.*

- Rick Weyrauch, Baytown Township Supervisor. I would just like to try and answer her [the previous] question. I'm on the Baytown Township Board. The no action/no change alternative is included here [referring to the presentation slides handout]. *Evan Barrett responded, "correct. It is included in all the tiers of analysis. We have it in the Tier B table and Tier C table for comparison purposes."* Rick then said, but it had four categories where it did not meet the objectives, so that's why it did not filter down through for the middle analysis, correct? *Evan reported that it's still included in the Tier C analysis even though it doesn't pass that Tier B test. He pointed out that it's outside the funnel [graphic].* Rick then said, but I do have a question as well. You have a certain amount of wetlands that you have being filled in for both alternatives? *Evan Barrett asked if he was referring to the finalist alternatives in the Tier C evaluation?* Rick responded, yes. *Evan then confirmed, yes, that's right.* Rick asked, do you have to offset and provide wetlands in some other place? What's the environmental cost for filling in that wetland? What's required to get permission to do that? *Evan responded that there's a permitting process under the US Clean Water Act that requires replacement of any wetlands that are filled in. For a federal action of any kind, there are certain ratios that have to be applied. For this area of the state, the replacement ratio is 2.5 to 1. For example, the Tier C analysis table for Alternative B1 shows a wetland impact (fill area) of 1.85 acres. He explained that you'd take that number times 2.5, which would be 4.625 and basically that's the number of acres that would need to be replaced somewhere else. He said there are different ways to accomplish that. Ideally, they'd be replaced within the same watershed, to provide the same function as those existing wetlands. He then reported we have not gotten to the point yet of identifying exactly what we're proposing to do as mitigation, but that will be considered in the coming months as part of this process.*
- Jack Ritt, resident of Baytown Township. As far as the wetland issue is concerned, it's a lot easier for a duck or a goose to find a new home, relocate, then it is for the poor citizens that are affected by the expected changes. That's a comment. The one-on-one that we're invited to go to is just nothing more, or less than, a divide-and-conquer, as far as I'm concerned. This is really, I think, a ruse. Let me give you an example. I had a company, and we decided about 20 or 30 years ago, that we were going to have uniforms. We had 100 employees and you can imagine the variety of opinions they had. It's like if you had five economists in this room, you could get five different answers. The only way to minimize that and make everyone happy was to pick out three styles of uniforms: two that we didn't like, and one that we did like. And you know what was amazing? All the employees picked the one that we liked, because the other ones were so bad. I think that's what's going on here and people don't realize what's really happening. All of this has been predetermined and I think it's very unfair to the community welfare that exists today and going forward. This expansion is not necessary – and I agree with you – the runways need improvement, there is no question they need to be upgraded, but I think this expansion goes way beyond what is necessary. We have a new bridge across the river now, it's a lot easier if you want to get to a big airport with bigger planes and more safety, it's just a few minutes from here by air. That's the end of my comment. *Todd Streeter thanked him for his comments.* Jack then said, I do have one more question. On a waterway, a sailboat has a right of way over a motor boat. In the air, how about the balloonists that use the air around here – how are they affected by your proposal? *Joe Harris answered that the balloons have the right of way and that the balloons that operate near Lake Elmo Airport will not be impacted by the proposed expansion.*

- No name or address given. Does this mean we will have more jet traffic over our homes? I live in West Lakeland. *Dana Nelson responded that is not the intent of the proposed improvements. She stated that there are a handful of small jet operations that take place at this airfield over the course of a year, and that is not anticipated to pick up to a great degree. Right now, it comprises less than one-tenth of a percent of the operations, and it is anticipated in the next 20 years to still be around one-tenth of one percent, and concluded by saying it's not a drastic increase in the jet traffic that we're expecting. She stated "the jets we do anticipate would be the small, lighter-type jet operations, nothing like what a 3M would bring – a Gulfstream or a Learjet or anything like that – it would be probably a Mustang if you're familiar with those types of small, under 10-seat light jet aircraft."* Neil Ralston then reiterated that the length the MAC is proposing for this runway is designed for small, propeller-driven airplanes. He said, "If we were designing a runway for regular use of larger, corporate jet aircraft, we would certainly be proposing a longer runway length than we're proposing. That's not what we're intending to do with this runway. It's to accommodate propeller-driven airplanes with less than 10 passenger seats, which is a category of aircraft designated by the Federal Aviation Administration."
- Barry Dayton, resident of the City of Stillwater. I'm a pilot/aviator currently based out of Lake Elmo. Just a comment, I want to say that I know there is no jet fuel available on the field today and I believe there are no plans for adding jet A or jet fuel in the foreseeable future, am I correct in that? *Joe Harris responded that that was correct; you cannot purchase jet fuel at the field today, and he was not aware of any future plans of making jet fuel available at the airport.*
- Brad Cornell, resident of West Lakeland Township. Looking at the plans and your \$8.3 million construction cost, how is it justified to spend almost \$800,000 in planning – I asked for the data back in May which you provided me the information of \$326,000 for the initial planning, and now \$401,000 for Mead & Hunt to do the environmental impact, how can you justify spending almost \$1 million just to get to the point where we are today, to spend another \$8.3 million to an environment, a community that doesn't want this expansion and leave our 30th Street straight. It affects 1,700 people a day and that's been documented by Washington County traffic. You're affecting a ton of people for 200 aircraft. I've tracked the drive time, it's 20 minutes, door to door, to New Richmond, one stoplight, two stop signs. How can you justify this kind of expense? I can see the justification to do this rework, shut down the runways, they get new runways, do the renovation just to replace the existing runways but those pilots are going to go somewhere else cause they're not going to sit and wait for that amount of time. How can you justify this for the community? *Chad Leque answered, regarding this question of the catalyst for the project in the first place, it really goes to the MAC's legislatively directed mandate to support aviation in the metropolitan area; which is to provide adequate and safe facilities for purposes of air transportation – both of passengers and cargo. He made the comparison that much like MnDOT is the purveyor of street transportation infrastructure in the state of Minnesota, the MAC (within the metropolitan area) is charged with the duty to make sure there exist adequate facilities for those that want to utilize air transportation. He explained that, because these airports are considered public assets, the MAC maintains them as such. They are public assets, though, that do not use general tax dollars. He noted that money that's used to plan, develop and maintain these facilities is generated by aviation. He further stated the money that goes into the planning work referenced in the question comes from the very people that use the facilities the MAC maintains in their airport system. Regarding the questions about the expense the MAC puts into planning, he said that when the MAC enters into planning projects*

like this, they take them seriously, and he didn't think this was unique to airports. He said, "By doing that, we want to make sure we're using the best amount of expertise that's available in that space to do an adequate job of evaluating truly what are the needs and what is the most efficient way to do it, while minimizing our environmental impact, and that's where we look to firms like Mead & Hunt and others that we partner with, much like cities do when they do their planning work – to take a look at what the options are, to evaluate them from an environmental perspective. There's nothing unique here, I believe, with regard to this type of a relationship and this type of a team when it comes to a project like that." Chad also mentioned that a portion of the budget referenced in the question, regarding planning, goes to some additional resources as it relates to the MAC increasing its efforts to be better at engaging the public. He referenced his opening remarks, in which he noted the MAC is trying to evolve as the process moves along. He said, "For those of you at the first meeting, I asked for your patience, and your partnership if you're willing, with us as we go through this process, because we really are trying to evolve it and make it better. And to do that, we have brought to bear some additional resources with the budget. Mr. Streeter is a great example of that." He said the MAC wants to be responsive in these processes, to people who have concerns with what the MAC is doing, and that they make sure that they are turning over every stone and doing all they can to be creative to try to reduce the impacts as much as possible while still providing adequate infrastructure at their airport facilities for the travelling public and people using their aircraft at the airport. He then noted that "When we talk about the evolution of the concept of expansion at Lake Elmo Airport – it's been a long journey." He referenced one of the boards at the open house and a graphic in the handout shows the discussion dates back to the 1960s. At that time, it was anticipated a 3,900-foot runway would be needed at Lake Elmo Airport to meet the needs of the aircraft category Neil Ralston talked about earlier as defined by the FAA – the less than 10 seat, light aircraft category. He continued, "Now if we move through time, to the point we're at today, that 3,900 feet, as you see this evening, has shrunk – for good reason – as part of a process – the public process. That 3,900 feet, going into the last long-term comprehensive plan, was sized back to 3,600 feet, as you saw tonight in option B, and then before the conclusion of that process was again cut back to 3,500 feet. That was, in large part, in response to some very valid concerns that were raised by the community, with regard to the 30th street realignment, and specifically the intersection with Neal Avenue and where that was occurring, in the environment of the airport. This has been a long dialogue. It's had a lot of twists and turns, but I do believe, if we take a look at the record (as I was mentioning to one individual tonight who was sharing valid concerns about the airport, it was clear there was nothing I was going to say that was going to make her comfortable with what we're looking at here at the airport because it's not the no action alternative – and I understand that), it's not been a black and white process. It's been a process that's evolved over time, and it's resulted in a scaled back option in terms of providing adequate facilities for our aircraft operators at the airport to provide them with an additional margin of safety, a little more ability to provide a bit more utility for the aircraft that they're operating—maybe to carry a little more fuel than they do today with the shorter runway, and also reconstruct the runway at the same time, and to Dana's point, provide RPZs that are clear and have no obstructions in them. So there's a lot of different targets we've been trying to hit in the process. There are tangible points in this process where you can say that there actually were things that happened because of the dialogue. It's a fact if you look at the record. The most recent one we touched on this evening, but the one before that – going from 3,600 to 3,500 feet, was a direct

accommodation by the MAC to try to do what we can to get the 30th Street alignment right. We went a step further with the CEP and we had a very candid dialogue with the community engagement panel about what are the things we should look at with regard to the 30th Street alignment to try and make it more palatable, make it more acceptable to the community. As Evan pointed out today, two things were raised: travel time and safety. So the planning team went on a mission to look at new designs, they actually found options that moved those needles in the right direction. They decreased the travel time, they improved the field of view needed to navigate intersections. We brought that back to the CEP and after weighing it, talking about it, the decision was that we didn't want to move forward with those alternatives and we respected that, but we put the time and resources in to be responsive to that committee, and that takes resources, as you've pointed out. It's a difficult task sometimes in that it is a balancing act." He reiterated that the MAC comes to the discussion with a mandate from the Legislature that cannot be denied; however, it is very clear in the MAC's legislation that as well as making sure that they have adequate facilities that are safe, they're also supposed to try to reduce the environmental impact. He noted that, as the Director of Environmental Programs at the MAC, that is something he takes very seriously. He went on to share one of the things discussed at the last CEP meeting are efforts that are being undertaken to design and implement enhancements to the voluntary noise abatement plan at Lake Elmo Airport. Dana Nelson's team is already working on implementing communication materials for the pilot community at the airport that highlight the MAC's voluntary noise abatement plan, such as inserts they can put in their pilot logbooks for reference while they're using their aircraft. He noted that Joe Harris, the airport manager, has been nice enough to put funds into developing signs that will go up on the airfield requesting that pilots fly neighborly. Chad said the point is that these things don't happen in a vacuum, and that his hope is that "once we get through the process, whatever the result is, we can have a continuing dialogue between the MAC and our community partners on how we can continue to advocate for neighborly operation of the airport. You have our commitment we will continue to do that, as a member of the community. We'll continue to try to work through the issues and do the best job we can in meeting a lot of stakeholders' concerns and issues on the topic." Neil Ralston then clarified that between the planning and environmental [funds spent] it's closer to \$750,000 than \$1 million. He also pointed out there are requirements the MAC must meet based on mandates from the FAA regarding planning and environmental work, such as airport layout plans, engineering drawings, forecasting and getting survey data out on the airfield, to name a few. He commented that that work is not cheap and said he didn't believe the MAC was being frivolous with their planning money. He speculated that those who do this type of work would probably think that with the money the MAC is spending, they've actually got a lot of value out of a fairly small amount of funds when compared to what other airports do and how they do it.

- John Krack, resident of Fridley. I fly out of Anoka County-Blaine Airport. Next month will be the 50th anniversary of getting my pilot's license. I've flown out of MAC airports for almost all those 50 years. I've been through probably three or four of these long-term comprehensive plans and this one is far and away the most comprehensive, the most thorough and the most transparent that I've ever seen. Previously what would happen is MAC would come up with a plan, they'd hold a hearing to get some input, they'd go back and make a few tweaks to the plan, and then pretty much do what they wanted to do. But I've seen what they're doing now with Lake Elmo, what they're doing with Airlake and also with Crystal, and they're taking the feedback, they are

making changes and they are trying to walk a fine line between their mandate and the concerns and the utility of the local communities and stakeholders. So, this is a process and in my experience, my observations, this is much more open than what's been done in the past. So we are very fortunate to have MAC's commitment to work with the communities, work with the other stakeholders to at least try and come up with a viable solution for these airports. Back in the day, these airports were out in the boon docks so to speak, nobody much cared about what happened and what we did and what kind of airplanes were on them, but as the communities have grown around the airports and we've also seen the airport tenants and people become more sensitive to the issues, MAC has made a commitment to work with the communities – and by the way, the pilots, we get it – we realize that we have to be good neighbors and be flexible how we operate our aircraft, how much noise we generate, what we fly over, because we realize these people are our neighbors – that you folks are our neighbors, and it's important we maintain those relations. And I applaud MAC for making the commitment and/or making both financial and the administrative commitments to be as transparent as they are, and to work with the communities to come up with solutions to the concerns. And I should say that I speak for myself and not for the MAC.

- Mick Kaschmitter, resident of West Lakeland Township. I've been very, very, very involved in a neighborhood group that's been in place for a couple years, we've engaged the major stakeholders in this and I just wanted to dispel the rumor to everybody: we have never proposed, we've never really discussed, nor would we want the airport to close. I think that's a rumor that's out there and I just want to make sure that everybody knows that we have never proposed or been for that. Also, I guess, to cut to the chase, do whatever you have to do on the airport grounds, but leave 30th Street alone. That's our primary concern and we just don't want it, at all.
- Dave Schultz, West Lakeland Township Supervisor. I have a comment. It sounded like MAC was taking and giving us something by going from 3,900 feet down to 3,600 feet. By today's standards, 3,900 feet would not be allowed, as that original 3,900 foot plan had 30th Street going through the RPZ and putting in a 3,900-foot runway, so there's no way that 3,900-foot runway would be an option today. Second, the runway protection zones are shrunken down from the 3,600-foot plan to what they are today – same size they are today, as you showed on the runway. So that's how things have gotten smaller – going from 3,600 to 3,500 you've also shown the RPZs as they are current today. So, just a comment. Thank you.
- Ann Bucheck, resident of City of Lake Elmo. I have two questions. One is when you're talking about the no build alternative, would that include redoing the runway so that it's in good shape for the pilots, and you also include upgrading the instrument approach procedures, because I don't think that anyone is opposed to that, and maybe that should be included in your proposals. The other thing is, I would like to know what size jet could land at the airport today. *Evan Barrett answered the first question, saying that the no action (or no build) alternative does include reconstructing the runways to bring them up to a safe, operable and long-term usable condition. It does not include upgrading instrument approach procedures due to obstacles in the approaches to some of the runway ends. There are also minimum requirements for runway length the FAA looks at in terms of types of approach procedures, so the runway length plays into that as well. In answering the second question, Evan referred back to what Dana Nelson had discussed earlier in the evening, that it is the very smallest class of jets that are out there, most would be less than 12,500 pounds, like the very-light jet Citation Mustang, or the Eclipse*

manufacturer makes a similar type of aircraft. He noted that, in some situations at a very low payload or fuel load, there are some smaller business jets above 12,500 pounds, that may be able to use the runway, but they would have to take off nearly empty, so the runway wouldn't have much use to them. They could land on it, but then they couldn't take off unless they offload fuel, passengers or cargo. He explained, that's where the usefulness of the runway becomes limited for those jet aircraft. Neil Ralston added that there was a [board out in the lobby showing Runway Length Needs](#), acknowledging that not everyone would necessarily know what the names of the different aircraft are, and said the board shows photos of some of those types of aircraft that were being talked about. It was also pointed out that the runway length graphic is in the [August newsletter](#) that was also handed out at the sign-in table. Neil then emphasized that the runway length is designed for the small propeller-driven airplane fleet, not a jet fleet. Ann then questioned, and if it's expanded, if you extend the runway, will there be bigger jets coming in? Neil clarified that his previous response was in regard to the proposed, extended runway length of 3,500 feet, reiterating, "The runway length we are proposing is designed to meet the needs of propeller-driven airplanes. That does not mean that a jet might not choose to land on it once in a while, like they do today, but it is not intended for regular use by jet aircraft."

- [Name inaudible], Pilot based at Airlake. I've been a pilot since 1969. I grew up in South St. Paul. South St. Paul has had a 4,000-foot runway since I can remember and the jet traffic out there is very minimal. We're talking about a 3,500-foot runway, so it's just not a factor.
- No name or address given. I don't understand the importance of the airport, first of all, and what it does for our community. Why would we want to authorize the additional jet traffic and you say well, it will be occasional, but you know how occasional goes.
- Michael Wilhelmi, Resident of Stillwater. I'm here at the request of a couple of citizens with concerns. I had a really nice chat with Neil, thank you very much. He answered a lot of my questions, but I had a couple questions I was hoping you could address. Some of the comments we heard that MAC has a legislative mandate you must meet – you have no choice, you also are limited by a railroad on the north, Manning Ave. on the west and 30th St. on the south, and the frustrating thing is as you're trying to meet your mandate as we kind of heard tonight, it seems like the easiest of all those things is to kind of push on the neighbors. I'd like to explore a little better, like to ask you to explore, the runway impact zone – in my conversation with Neil, apparently, it was a 2012 rule that things had to be moved out or certain land uses could not be considered to be in the runway impact zone. Has there been any conversation, or are you aware of any waiver that's been done anywhere in the United States that would allow for something to happen? Honestly, I think some of the neighbors – what they're saying is that with 30th Street, those changes affect 1,700 people a day using that road, and I don't know how many more aircraft will be able to use this airport more safely as a result of the construction. *Evan Barrett asked for further clarification on what the specific question was – if it was regarding guidance regarding the new rules on the runway protection zone?* Michael admitted he hadn't been very clear and further clarified his question: I was curious if the MAC had explored if there are there any waivers in the United States at any other airports that are doing/have done something essentially what you're trying to do, that allow the airport to have a railroad in the RPZ? *Evan replied that the FAA's policy generally is that if there's an alternative that provides a clear runway protection zone that's feasible and practical, then that's the alternative you should pursue, all other things being equal. In this particular case, at Lake Elmo, there are alternatives that are feasible and practical, that do clear those runway protection zones. Again, the runway*

protection zone is a big piece of the Purpose & Need and why the runway is moving. But, that's being weighed among other factors, and when the FAA looks at this, when they look at our RPZs, and they may say in this situation there might be something else that outweighs the need to clear that RPZ, they may consider it. But it really depends on a mix of variables. In this particular case, because there are multiple alternatives that would result in clear RPZs that meet the Purpose & Need and avoid other environmental impacts, when compared with the other alternatives, that's clearly going to be the alternative that the FAA is going to recommend, and at the end of the day, the Environmental Assessment is a federal FAA document, and so they do have a say in what the preferred alternative is. Michael then asked, regarding the feasibility, I understand that both the MAC and FAA will look at feasibility and say, well we can move this road, and we can still meet our mission – that's your job, that's what you have to do. But, the neighbors would say that's not feasible. I'm not only asking for a waiver for the railroad tracks, but I'm also curious to know if the MAC has studied moving the railroad tracks rather than moving the street. If those are the things that are bounding you, if that is something that was examined as well. Evan Barrett responded that he believed the LTCP had an alternative that looked at realigning Manning Ave., but it was pretty significant in terms of impact. Neil Ralston clarified that the LTCP showed the possible realignment of Manning Ave. that would have to be evaluated if the existing runway stayed in place, but it was not presented as an alternative. He further stated that the LTCP did not look at relocating the railroad tracks. Chad Leque then reiterated what Evan Barrett had stated earlier – that this is a federal document – both an environmental assessment to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act as well as a state EAW which meets the state's environmental policy. He said he had no doubt that the question of the 30th Street realignment is going to likely be a theme through the end of this dialogue, including the public hearing, which means there will be public comments on the topic that will have to be responded to, and ultimately, a decision document will have to be issued by the FAA. He further stated the position by the FAA to date has been clear, but that the questions should continue to be asked in the context of this project as it goes forward. He said it's not completely outside the bounds of possibility that, in certain circumstances, as things evolve, the FAA may look at things differently. He couldn't say that's going to be the case here, and said "it doesn't feel like it's going to be the case at this point, but I've seen it happen." He reiterated that's why these dialogues are important and that's why a public hearing is going to be important – for everybody to come and get their thoughts and concerns on the record. He said, at the end of the day, it's the FAA that has to issue the approval document on the environmental assessment. He further stated the ongoing dialogue the MAC has with the FAA about those kinds of community questions and concerns is designed into the planning process, and said those are the types of questions he'd expect to be asked and answered during a public comment period. Neil added that, even if the runway could be shifted a little bit further north, there would still be a bend in 30th Street. He noted it may be a little less of a bend, but there would still be a bend, and that leaving 30th Street in place with a clear runway protection zone would result in an extremely short runway.

Todd Streeter then encouraged community members to head into the cafeteria to meet with the project team and continue the dialogue in the one-on-one engagement session.

Meeting Minutes

The Q&A adjourned at approximately 7:40 p.m. The one-on-one engagement session ended at approximately 8:15 p.m.